

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9-19, and 22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 20, and 21 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 2, 3, 9-13, 18, and 22 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**Claims 1 and 9**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,046,633 to Shimizu. Since claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 3, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2

The Office Action rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shimizu in view of U.S. Patent 5,250,931 to Misawa et al. ("Misawa"). Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Office Action indicates that claim 3 includes allowable subject matter. Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form to expedite prosecution in the above-identified patent application. Since claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 3, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 6

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shimizu in view of U.S. Patent 5,627,457 to Ishiyama et al. ("Ishiyama"). Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 is respectfully requested. In addition, Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Office Action indicates that claim 3 includes allowable subject matter. Since claim 6 depends from claim 2,

and claim 2 depends from claim 3, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-22

The Office Action rejects claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Misawa in view of Shimizu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Applicant asserts that Misawa and Shimizu, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest "wherein the voltage supplied through the innerconnecting line is gray scale driving voltage," as recited in claims 18 and 22.

The Office Action asserts, "Shimizu discloses the voltage supplied (11c, Fig. 6) through the innerconnecting line is gray scale driving voltage." However, neither Shimizu nor Misawa specifically teaches a "gray scale driving voltage." Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 3, 10, 11, 18 and 22 are distinguishable over the applied art. The remainder of the claims that depend from independent claims 3, 10, 11, and 18 are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

II. Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9-19, and 22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard S. Elias
Registration No. 48,806

JAO:RSE/dap

Date: March 16, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--